

Final project workshop

Kampala, Uganda

Event report

Taking action against wildlife crime in Uganda

Final project workshop and launch of the Community-Based
Wildlife Crime Prevention Actions Plans



Author information

This report was compiled by:

Julia Baker, a biodiversity specialist at Balfour Beatty and research advisor for the project.

Dilys Roe, principal researcher and team leader of the biodiversity team at IIED.

About the event

For more information about this project, please contact Dilys Roe, IIED, dilys.roe@iied.org

IIED is a policy and action research organisation. We promote sustainable development to improve livelihoods and protect the environments on which these livelihoods are built. We specialise in linking local priorities to global challenges. IIED is based in London and works in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and the Pacific, with some of the world's most vulnerable people. We work with them to strengthen their voice in the decision-making arenas that affect them — from village councils to international conventions.

Photo: Mountain gorilla photographed by M Mahboobeh in Uganda, 2013

Published by IIED, June 2017

International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399

Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055

www.iied.org

 @iied

 www.facebook.com/theIIED

Download more publications at <http://pubs.iied.org>

IIED is a charity registered in England, Charity No.800066 and in Scotland, OSCR Reg No.SC039864 and a company limited by guarantee registered in England No.2188452.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Summary | 2 |
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Building capacity in Uganda | 3 |
| 1.2 The workshop | 3 |
| 2. Presentations | 4 |
| 2.1 Welcome and project recap | 4 |
| 2.2 Research findings | 4 |
| 2.3 Project output 1: Wildlife crime database | 5 |
| 2.4 Project output 2: Wildlife scout review | 6 |
| 2.5 Project output 3: Wildlife crime action plans | 7 |
| 2.6 Putting the plans into action: Initial experiences | 7 |
| 3. Doing conservation differently | 9 |
| 3.1 U-PCLG's policy briefing | 9 |
| 3.2 Panel discussion with UWA's headquarters staff | 9 |
| 3.3 Panel discussion with UWA's national park staff | 10 |
| 4. Final reflections | 12 |

Summary

Illegal poaching and trafficking of wildlife has increased rapidly over recent years. But international calls to strengthen wildlife protection can have devastating consequences for the rural poor. So how can we tackle wildlife crime in a 'pro-poor' way without unnecessarily penalising poor people and, ideally, while generating livelihood benefits for them?

'[Building capacity for pro-poor responses to wildlife crime in Uganda](#)' was a three-year project which ran from 2014 to 2017. The project involved conducting research to improve our understanding of the links between wildlife crime and poverty, using the findings to design and implement pro-poor interventions to tackle wildlife crime in Uganda. The project also gathered lessons for the international community on preventing wildlife crime by addressing its root causes and improving local livelihoods. The ultimate goal was to provide policy makers with the tools and capacity to understand the links between wildlife crime, biodiversity and poverty, and so to target interventions effectively for the benefit of both wildlife and people.

Funded by the UK government's Illegal Wildlife Trade Fund (IWT), the project partners were the [International Institute of Environment and Development](#) (IIED), the [Uganda Wildlife Authority](#) (UWA), the [Interdisciplinary Centre for Conservation Science at Oxford University](#) (ICCS) and the [Wildlife Conservation Society](#) (WCS).

This report documents the proceedings of the final project workshop held in Kampala, Uganda. This one-day workshop was held to present the outputs of the project, host panel sessions with UWA staff from the organisation's headquarters and national parks, and to officially launch the 'Community-Based Wildlife Crime Prevention Action Plans'.

The presentations given at the workshop can be viewed on IIED's SlideShare site, available at : <http://www.slideshare.net/IIEDslides/>

1. Introduction

1.1 Building capacity in Uganda

'[Building capacity for pro-poor responses to wildlife crime in Uganda](#)' was a three-year project which ran from March 2014 to March 2017. The project supported existing work by the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) on improving livelihoods of the rural poor. Focusing on Uganda, the project involved conducting a literature review and field research in two of the country's oldest and largest national parks (the Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks). Interventions were then designed specifically to tackle wildlife crime at these national parks - without unnecessarily penalising poor people and, where possible, generating livelihood benefits for them.

The project also gathered lessons for the international community on addressing the causes of wildlife crime while improving local livelihoods. The ultimate goal was to provide policy makers with the tools and capacity to understand the links between wildlife crime, biodiversity and poverty, and so to target interventions effectively for the benefit of both wildlife and people.

1.2 The workshop

A final workshop, titled 'Taking action against wildlife crime in Uganda', was held in Kampala, Uganda to mark the end of the project period. The aim of the workshop was to disseminate the findings of project activities undertaken during the final year and to officially launch the new action plans produced for the case study national parks. The workshop was attended by members of the British Council, the UWA, Uganda's Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, Uganda's Poverty and Conservation Learning Group and NGOs working in conservation and development in Uganda.

2. Presentations

2.1 Welcome and project recap

Simon Nampindo (WCS) welcomed participants to the workshop and described the workshop's aims and objectives.

The **Executive Director of UWA** gave the opening address. He described how wildlife crime in Uganda is a major conservation challenge, especially when criminal syndicates are involved. In the past, conserving wildlife relied on scientific understanding of animals and habitats, but now it is about arming rangers with ever increasing fire power to combat serious criminal activity. Such weaponry was never standard issue for wildlife rangers although, given the current status of Uganda's national parks, it is now a necessity. The UWA has a successful track record of combating wildlife crime, as Uganda's elephant numbers have increased, but the threats continue and require constant vigilance. However, the traditional approach of focusing only on law enforcement is not effective and Uganda has long recognised that engaging with the communities living alongside wildlife is important. These communities are the 'first defence' so working with them is vital. This project will greatly help UWA's efforts in this regard and, by doing so, strengthen its actions to tackle wildlife crime. The Executive Director thanked the UK government for funding this project and formally opened the workshop.

Dilys Roe (IIED) introduced the 'Building capacity for pro-poor responses to wildlife crime in Uganda' project, clarifying that, in the context of the project, the term 'pro-poor' simply means reducing wildlife crime without unnecessarily penalising poor people and, ideally, while benefitting local communities. The term 'wildlife crime' was defined as:

"Any harm to (or intent to harm or to subsequently trade) non-domesticated wild animals, plants and fungi, in contravention of national and international laws and conventions."

This definition was chosen because it encompasses the full range of wildlife crime that typically occurs within a protected area, from commercial trading of 'animal trophies' to collection of medicinal plants for subsistence needs. Recognising this range is vital in order to fully understand the links between wildlife crime and poverty.

Over the last three years, the main activities of the project have been:

- An [Evidence Review](#) that sought to help understand the complex relationship between wildlife crime and poverty in Uganda; it focused on Uganda while also drawing on international evidence
- Research in Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Park [to better understand who undertakes wildlife crime and why](#)
- A [policy brief by the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group](#) that describes the need to 'do conservation differently' to truly tackle wildlife crime in Uganda
- A review of [Wildlife Scout Programmes](#) in Uganda, and
- New Community-Based Wildlife Crime Prevention Action Plans for [Queen Elizabeth](#) and [Murchison Falls](#) National Parks.

Finally, the project team developed a Theory of Change which was reviewed at the end of the workshop to see if it held true.

2.2 Research findings

Henry Travers (Oxford University) introduced the research which was carried out at Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks where various wildlife crimes occur. The research aimed to better understand why people commit wildlife crime and to identify how efforts to tackle wildlife crime can be improved while not unfairly affecting the rural poor.

The research methods combined direct and indirect approaches. Direct approaches asked how and why people are involved in wildlife crime. Understandably, individuals can withhold information using this approach because of the sensitive nature of the topic and it is unethical to put anyone at risk of

incriminating themselves. Since direct approaches rarely give results that accurately represent a population, indirect approaches were also used to estimate the proportion of people involved in wildlife crime without directly asking anyone specifically.

Henry summarised the research findings which were presented at the [Research Results Workshop](#) in May 2016, and then responded to questions from workshop participants.

The first question regarded the increasing numbers of wildlife in Uganda's national parks and whether current levels of wildlife crime are sustainable? Uganda's population is rising rapidly, especially around the case study national parks and, while wildlife numbers appear strong now, there is a real concern that next year wildlife will be under extensive pressure again as resources outside the parks are depleted and rural communities seek resources from national parks.

Clarity on which months were the peak hunting season was sought. Peak seasons changed according to the location. For example, in areas where people farm during the wet season, they will likely hunt during the dry season, but in areas where people farm during the dry season, they will likely hunt during the wet season. Hunting generally corresponds to when people have fewer options to earn an income from other activities.

One participant highlighted the research finding that there were extremely few arrests relative to the number of law enforcement patrols, and asked whether poachers are able to avoid UWA's patrols or whether the patrols are not sufficient? Patrolling these two parks is incredibly difficult given the vast area to cover. Also UWA's rangers are often detected by poachers who then flee avoiding arrest. The key is to strengthen intelligence; the research results show that UWA is more likely to receive intelligence from local communities if they implement or support activities to improve local livelihoods.

The final question regarded the importance of allowing communities into national parks to access natural resources and whether this supports efforts to tackle wildlife crime? There are benefits from allowing local communities access to resources within national parks including communities being more likely to support park conservation and provide intelligence on wildlife crime.

2.3 Project output 1: Wildlife crime database

Geoffrey Mwedde (WCS) introduced the online wildlife crime database. UWA spends between 50 to 95 per cent of their annual operational budgets on law enforcement but, until recently, did not track the effectiveness of this spend. Support was given to develop and roll-out a database called MIST, which aimed to track law enforcement efforts and assess how effective these were. Improvements were made to MIST and the updated database (SMART) helped UWA to plan law enforcement patrols more efficiently by identifying where patrols were undertaken and where the gaps were. However, no data were collected on the offenders themselves to improve sentencing, especially for repeat offenders, so the WCS developed a wildlife crime database to address this gap. Geoffrey summarised the main components of the database (which had been presented at the [Research Results Workshop](#)) and gave an update on recent activities, which have included:

- Developing a fingerprint module that pulls all names used by the same person to try and avoid sentencing for repeat offenders
- Putting the database online to be able to track the same offenders across all national parks and ensure all of their wildlife crimes are presented to the courts
- Installing an option to upload data when offline (given limited internet connection at national parks) which is then uploaded to the online database when connected to the internet
- Mapping villages and parishes where offenders are from, thereby adding to our understanding of who undertakes wildlife crime and identifying hot-spots, and
- Updating the structure of the database to include a profile of each offender.

The challenges have included ensuring internet connection at the national parks through the use of dongles; addressing the need for a dedicated computer at each park; ensuring there is greater commitment by UWA's leadership to roll out the database; and undertaking training for all staff using the database.

Questions from workshop participants included whether the database is linked to other databases held by the police and can be used to check whether the offender has committed other crimes? This is not currently in place but discussions are progressing about how this could be implemented. There was also a question as to the extent to which UWA is using the database? The database has been extremely well received although the problem has been internet connection in the national parks. Clarification was given on the accessibility of the database, which is only available to UWA and not accessible to the public due to the sensitive information it contains.

2.4 Project output 2: Wildlife scout review

Geoffrey Mwedde presented the review of wildlife scout programmes in Uganda. In the context of the review, the term 'wildlife scouts' refers to community members who have formed a group to voluntarily participate in addressing Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC). Scout group formation is usually initiated by an external organisation, for example local government, NGOs, a private company or a community institution.

Crop and livestock raiding by wildlife is a significant cost for poor, rural communities. Farmers can lose crops and livestock which they depend on for subsistence needs, suffer the economic and social costs from spending days and nights guarding their land, and can be injured when scaring away wild animals. Consequently, HWC is a significant cause of conflict between local people and conservation authorities that can threaten conservation efforts. Many initiatives exist to address HWC by contributing towards the economic development of local communities to compensate for crop/livestock losses. While this approach has proven successful, other case studies show that contributing towards local economic development is not enough to secure positive conservation outcomes and that preventing or reducing crop/livestock raiding by wild animals is essential.

Wildlife scout programmes have emerged as a potentially effective and financially sustainable solution and many now exist across Africa. However, while individual case studies have been published, there have been few assessments on what approach to wildlife scout programmes will be successful.

From this review, lessons for ensuring the success of wildlife scout programmes in Uganda included:

- Facilitation and incentives are vital to motivate individuals to continue as scouts for the long term since most wildlife scout programmes in Uganda are not institutionalised, with individuals undertaking the work on a voluntary basis.
- Direct payment is the highest motivation. However, this is often not viable because of uncertainties surrounding donor-funded projects, the lack of institutional mechanisms of the scouts themselves and the lack of long term donor financing. Nonetheless, paying scouts a salary is an important consideration to ensure these programmes sustain over the long term. Alternatively, a payment 'of appreciation' at the end of every month and/or food allowances would be suitable.
- Other valuable incentives include; starting viable income generating activities; establishing savings schemes; providing training and equipment; enhancing community status; registering wildlife scouts at community-based organisations; and providing health insurance.

Comments from workshop participants centred around learning from past experience. It was noted that USAID funds given to UWA during the 1990s helped establish a protected area advisory committees which led to corrupt activity. Conversely, a model by IUCN in north-eastern Uganda is working well where communities take the lead in undertaking activities to address HWC. Often scouts receive NGO support that then finishes leaving the scouts without any sustainable foundation, so planning wildlife scout programmes carefully to ensure long term viability is vital. Experience from Bwindi Impenetrable National Park shows that group activities (rather than supporting individuals) work well. For example, if you give a goat to an individual they will eat the goat and then forget that it came from the national park, but undertaking group activities are more effective for the long term. Between 2011 and 2012, around Murchison Falls National Park, communities mobilised themselves to form a voluntary scout programme. They received NGO support for equipment and many other villages wanted to join and talked about how 'we are helping UWA to chase elephants from farmlands'. However, it wasn't long before they started asking for payment. This became a difficult issue because funding is not available, although the park is working closely with the scouts to try and resolve this.

2.5 Project output 3: Wildlife crime action plans

Henry Travers presented the new action plans which have been produced for Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks. The Community-Based Wildlife Crime Prevention Action Plans provide a strategic vision for addressing wildlife crime within the parks. The plans establish clear priorities over the next five-year period (2017-2023) with respect to different wildlife offences, identify key target groups engaged in wildlife crime, and set out intervention options which form part of the longer term efforts by UWA and its partners to address wildlife crime.

Several activities within the plans are already being implemented by UWA and other supporting organisations. However, the plan brings everything together to maximise synergies and minimise conflicts. This approach will not only strengthen UWA's ability to combat wildlife crime directly through improved law enforcement, but also focus efforts on tackling the underlying drivers of wildlife crime. The action plan has been designed to complement the General Management Plans and Annual Operational Plans which encompass broader goals than the reduction of wildlife crime.

Three priority offences identified within the action plans are:

- Illegal hunting and trade of high-value wildlife species
- Commercial hunting and trade of bushmeat species, and
- Subsistence hunting for bushmeat.

For each priority offence, a range of interventions have been identified to be supported by UWA and partner organisations. The plans highlight linkages between these interventions and identified priority areas, ensuring that resources are not spread too thinly but targeted towards communities where the need is greatest (for example areas of HWC or where wildlife crime is high). Finally, the plans identify the potential implementation barriers that need to be addressed if successful outcomes are to be achieved. These include:

- Ensuring a balanced allocation of funding between law enforcement and community conservation activities
- Institutional commitment to engaging with communities
- Addressing capacity gaps and staff training, and
- Avoiding perverse incentives.

Participants asked whether the action plans address the significant external drivers of wildlife crime, such as markets and value chain issues? The plans are set at park-level in order to combat park-level drivers, but they sit within Uganda's national strategy to tackle wildlife crime including these wider issues. One participant commented that when boys start hunting and receive money in their pockets they become used to that lifestyle and then it is much harder to change their hunting behaviour so tackling young men is vital. Another participant stated that UWA has to be fully engaged in these initiatives so that they see for themselves that they are working, rather than being told by NGOs. The team confirmed that the action plans belong to UWA, they had been developed with UWA park staff at each national park and approved by the UWA Executive Director.

2.6 Putting the plans into action: Initial experiences

Maz Robertson and colleagues from the Uganda Conservation Foundation (UCF) presented progress with their IWT funded project which was designed based on the research findings of this project.

UCF is working in both Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks at sites where law enforcement records showed high numbers of local community members arrested for wildlife crime and where HWC is a major issue for local communities. For example, in two locations around Murchison Falls National Park where elephant crop raiding is high, UCF is supporting a wildlife scout programme. In one area where scouts existed but without any support, UCF has undertaken a series of training activities for 25 scouts. A total of 25 scouts were chosen as this was seen as a workable number of individuals to give sufficient livelihood support that ensures these individuals continue as scouts after the UCF project

finishes. The livelihood support has included wildlife friendly enterprises such as planting chili that also deters elephants from crop raiding. Around Queen Elizabeth National Park, UCF has supported community groups to implement food gardens. These groups comprise a minimum of 60 per cent women and UCF is supporting them to grow fruit and vegetables for local tourism lodges.

These activities have been received extremely positively by local communities to engage with these projects, but a key lesson is that they must start small in order to provide long term support to individual community members (instead of supporting many people but only in the short term). There is also a need to consult the communities on the design and implementation of these projects, and to build lasting partnerships between communities and conservation agencies.

3. Doing conservation differently

3.1 U-PCLG's policy briefing

Arthur Mugisha from the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (U-PCLG) presented U-PCLG's policy briefing on the research findings. The key findings were:

- Many people are engaged in wildlife crime, for various reasons: in some cases it is because they have few other opportunities to earn income, in others it is because they are angry about the lack of support they receive to deal with human-wildlife conflict.
- Protected area ranger patrols can (and do) help deter wildlife crime. However, the likelihood of someone either encountering a ranger or being prosecuted is low so many people feel it is still worth the risk to enter the park illegally.
- Ranger patrols do not address the fundamental drivers of wildlife crime: a lack of livelihood opportunities and insufficient attention to human-wildlife conflict.
- Although UWA has a community conservation unit which does attempt to address these issues, it suffers from a lack of sufficient resources and from poor relationships between the law enforcement unit and local people; there is a lack of trust on both sides.
- To date, UWA has not considered the activities of its community conservation unit as being part of the overall effort to combat wildlife crime.
- If wildlife crime is to be effectively tackled there needs to be a better balance between the current focus on law enforcement and community engagement and better coordination between the UWA staff responsible for different aspects of wildlife crime prevention.
- Park-level action plans help to clarify the priority interventions that UWA can adopt along with conservation and development partners.
- Leadership is needed from UWA headquarters and conservation area managers to ensure appropriate action is taken and provide the necessary support for park staff to own and implement the plans.

3.2 Panel discussion with UWA's headquarters staff

Julia Baker (IIED) led a panel discussion with Candia Leone (Senior Wildlife Officer at the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities), Adonia Binoota (UWA's Community Conservation Director) and Charles Tumwesigye (UWA's Deputy Director of Conservation). The session proceeded with each panel member giving their thoughts on key messages from the presentations. These included:

Candia Leone: Putting communities at the heart of conservation is not a new concept, although we are moving in the right direction. The policy recommendations are good but we must consider alternatives, as these options might work in some national parks but not others. The research recommendations provide a starting point, but considering the full range of options available is important. It is vital to establish indicators to show when community conservation and law enforcement is better balanced, as well as the conditions that will incentivise communities to engage. One condition could be that communities have ownership rights over a resource or gain direct benefits, but when this is not possible (for example a lack of security of tenure) who is responsible for addressing that - UWA, the Ministry? There are also issues of mutual trust that must be addressed. Without community acceptance of UWA as a legitimate authority there will be no real engagement. Finally, fair law enforcement is critical and we need to win the heart of the communities by building their confidence in the authorities.

Adonia Binoota: The research has highlighted the lack of attention to communities within our efforts to tackle wildlife crime. The role of local communities is vital and we support the action plans. About the recommendation to reallocate budget more fairly between community conservation and law enforcement, in 1995 community conservation was introduced in Mt Elgon National Park. It took time to convince senior authorities that it would work and now there are several community-based activities such as the revenue

sharing programme. However, law enforcement generates direct and measurable results, whereas it is harder to measure the effectiveness of community conservation. Consequently, law enforcement is seen as the priority to tackle wildlife crime. It is true there is not enough budget for community conservation and when under pressure community conservation is the first budget to be cut. Regarding training, there is a programme to send our rangers to Tanzania although there is no formal training in community-based conservation. Updating UWA's Community Conservation Policy is critical, as many things have changed since 2004 when it was introduced, although currently we lack the funds to undertake this.

Charles Tumwesigye: UWA has been part of this research and, as an institution, there may be varying views about law enforcement and community initiatives. However, we must remember the different drivers of poaching because wildlife crime is an international issue with drivers far from the protected areas, and often these drivers are more significant than drivers at the community level. It is also important to remember that law enforcement has evolved; it is no longer just about ranger patrols but also about intelligence, investigations and prosecutions. Therefore, the resources committed have to address all these issues. At the policy level, UWA's Community Conservation Unit is now a sub-directorate with three units (education; HWC; community benefits and enterprise) which is a step forward. We agree this needs strengthening and the resources are not sufficient but creating the directorate is a positive step by the UWA Board. UWA are looking for partners to help them raise revenue for the training in community conservation. Our law enforcement training is often done by NGO partners, so we ask NGOs to support the training of community conservation staff.

Julia then invited comments from the workshop participants: a senior manager within UWA stated that it is not fair to compare the budgets of law enforcement with community conservation, as it can take 10 rangers to arrest one poacher but only one community conservation ranger is needed to speak to 100 people. It is important to develop strategic partnerships for UWA, such as working with District Environmental Officers, in order to gain benefits from the work of these complementary partners. A representative of a wildlife conservation NGO agreed with the comment about the budget commenting that there are many activities that UWA undertake that require funding. He also suggested that the existing law enforcement training for rangers includes community conservation, especially as law enforcement rangers often work directly with communities. A member of Budongo Field Research Station supported the recommendation to revise UWA's Community Conservation Policy although described the importance of an enabling environment for community-based interventions to work, especially access to market because many community interventions involve income-generating activities. The updated policy must emphasise support for communities to access markets, as well as the need for communities themselves to identify products that are relevant to them and their area. Julia invited the panel members to respond to these comments. Their responses included:

Charles Tumwesigye: The issue about budgets is not about how small the budget for community conservation is, but how it is utilised especially in terms of the best use of manpower. Including community conservation aspects within ranger training on law enforcement will be a good step forward. At UWA, the park-level action plans are welcome and UWA is committed to spearheading their implementation with support from our partners.

Adonia Binoota: We do need resource mobilisation for community-based activities, but we also need to look beyond UWA for donor support. At Murchison Falls National Park for example, eight community conservation rangers is clearly not enough so it is vital we involve our partners in these action plans.

Candia Leone: Let us put resources where we receive the most returns; we need to empower communities to fulfil their own responsibilities and we need other sectors of government to help communities meet their development challenges. These issues are not all for UWA to resolve as they are fundamental development challenges.

3.3 Panel discussion with UWA's national park staff

EJ Milner-Gulland (Oxford University) led a panel discussion with Tom Okello (UWA Chief Warden), Olivia Birra (UWA's Community Conservation Warden from Queen Elizabeth National Park) and Gatrude Kirabo (UWA's Community Conservation Warden from Murchison Falls National Park).

Olivia Birra: I have worked in seven of UWA's protected areas and we at UWA need better engagement with communities to build their trust. UWA's community conservation staff are understaffed and need

specialist training to be able to respond to changing conditions within the communities. They also need equipment, especially in terms of transport and materials such as educational materials to improve outreach activities. Most frontline communities interface with wildlife on a daily basis. These people are well positioned to engage with conservation if they have positive incentives to do so; for this they need group projects that support their livelihoods, not schemes for individuals.

Gatrude Kirabo: A key element is improving coordination between national parks staff and local government. An important step at Murchison Falls National Park has been to engage security departments at regional and local levels and bring the police on board so that they support our efforts. The community conservation and law enforcement teams need to communicate better so each understands what the other is doing; for example, the recommendation to have joint planning meetings on resolving conflicts. At such meetings the law enforcement rangers can inform community staff of arrests made so that the community conservation staff can target their awareness-raising activities.

Tom Okello: I agree with the recommendations from the research. We need to rethink resource allocation but, as resources are never enough, we also need to prioritise the resources we have. HWC is one of the biggest issues but we need to evaluate the effectiveness of current interventions. Regarding the recommendation to develop wildlife friendly enterprises, we need to be careful of 'development partner syndrome' where interventions are seen by local people as 'handouts' and there is no continuation when the funding ends. About the recommendation to target resources at priority sites for wildlife crime and HWC, we are aware of hotspots and agree we need to target these but we need partners who do not just give us a list of actions, but support on the implementation as we have limited resources at UWA. About the wildlife scouts programme, we need to fully evaluate the existing programmes to identify how to strengthen them.

EJ Milner-Gulland invited comments from the workshop participants: a senior official from the Ministry described that we go to the communities to win their support but do not always look at how their needs can be linked with conservation. As long as they do not benefit from wildlife, they will not support conservation. We need to understand how they can directly benefit from wildlife, perhaps these wildlife-friendly enterprises, so that they look at wildlife in the same way that they look at cattle - otherwise they will just pay lip service to conservation. A community conservation lead within UWA stated that in some places wildlife scouts have been effective but each place requires a specific strategy for the circumstances. A representative of a NGO commented that the issue of community-based training was paramount, as community conservation rangers are not formally trained and solely on community conservation wardens, yet these wardens are not trained either. Such training occurs in many other countries but not Uganda. He also described research at Mt Elgon National Park that showed that game scouts resulted in local communities being far more likely to participate in conservation. Another workshop participant commented that local people have lost their relationship with national parks because of HWC and this issue needs better understanding to know why animals are leaving the national parks. A senior manager of UWA commented that the budget for community conservation in UWA has hardly increased since community conservation was first introduced several years ago. We need to change the attitudes of many conservationists from prioritising law enforcement to prioritising community engagement. The community conservation staff cannot deliver their objectives if they do not have the budget. EJ invited the panel to respond to the comments, these included:

Tom Okello: We agree about changing attitudes, although the issue depends on the specific context of the park. For example, we need law enforcement at Murchison Falls because there are communities involved with the Lords Resistance Army.

Olivia Birra: One cause of crop raiding by wild animals is change in land use because of human population increases, with local people now farming right up to the park boundaries. We need a variety of community-based approaches to deal with different situations, for example income generating projects, buffer crops and elephant trenches. This variety is important because different activities work with different land uses and community types.

4. Final reflections

The **Executive Director of UWA** formally launched the Community-Based Wildlife Crime Prevention Action Plans, confirming UWA's commitment to implementing them.



Dilys Roe closed the workshop by thanking the Executive Director for his support of the project and the action plans, and by thanking all of the workshop participants for their contributions. She reflected on the original objectives of the project and how these had been achieved culminating with recent news that a follow up grant has been awarded to pilot the action plans in Murchison Falls National Park. This new phase will have a strong emphasis on capacity development of UWA's community conservation staff. The project partners therefore look forward to reconvening and continuing to work with UWA over the next four years.

'Building capacity for pro-poor responses to wildlife crime in Uganda' (2014-2017) aims to increase national capacity to deliver pro-poor responses to wildlife crime. By increasing understanding about the links between wildlife crime and poverty it will also provide lessons with international applicability.

This report documents the proceedings of the final project workshop held in Kampala, Uganda.

The workshop officially launched the Community-Based Wildlife Crime Prevention Action Plans for the Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks.



Event
Materials

Biodiversity

Keywords:
Wildlife crime, livelihoods, pro-poor, Uganda



International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
www.iied.org

Funded by:



This research was grant funded by the UK government's Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund, however the views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the UK government.